

Applicant respectfully traverses this restriction/election requirement. Applicant presumes that this a combined restriction requirement (between claims 1-4 and claims 5-24) combined with an election of species requirement. As recited in MPEP § 803, a requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions is proper if two basic criteria are met:

(A) The inventions must be independent . . . or distinct as claimed . . . ; and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required . . . .  
(*Emphasis added.*)

Applicant respectfully submits that a search of the relevant prior art for the “two-layered wipe” and the “three-layered wipe” would not put a “serious burden” on the examiner, because a search of prior art for one would uncover all of the relevant prior art documents for the other. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this restriction requirement.


Notwithstanding the above and if the Examiner maintains this restriction requirement, applicant provisionally elect claims 5-24 (“three-layered wipes”) with traversal for further prosecution on the merits. Applicant also elects the “three-layered wipes” having a moisture absorbing center layer (e.g., claims 5-7, and 10-18).

### Conclusion

Applicants believe they have provided a complete response to the restriction requirement. For the reasons articulated above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

By:   
Samuel S. Lee  
Registration No. 41,938

Four Embarcadero Center  
Suite 1450  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 705-6377 Telephone  
(415) 705-6383 Facsimile